



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2023

by E Worthington BA (Hons) MTP MUED MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/D/23/3318004

22 Albany Drive, Dalton, Kirklees, Huddersfield, HD5 9UR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Mear against the decision of Kirklees Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/62/92860/E, dated 24 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'front porch to be constructed to include access to front of house and downstairs WC'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling in a residential area. It forms part of a row of similar properties on the southern side of the cul-de-sac at Albany Drive and is set back and up from the road.
 4. The proposed single storey front extension would be 3 metres long with a maximum height of 3.3 metres and would project 1.8 metres forward of the front elevation. It would provide a front entrance, hall and WC and the appellant indicates that it is the minimum necessary size to accommodate these and to meet insulation requirements.
 5. The proposal was amended during the Council's consideration of the planning application and incorporates a hipped roof and the use of matching tiles, brick and mortar. Even so, the extension would be considerable in size with a footprint of some 5.9 square metres. It would be prominently located on the front of the dwelling where it would project well forward of the building line and cover around half of its front elevation at ground floor level. As a result, the proposal would appear as an unduly large and dominant feature on the relatively modest host dwelling. It would not appear subservient to it and would overwhelm its appearance.
 6. Although it is set back from the road and has a front garden, the appeal property occupies an elevated and highly visible position on Albany Drive. Whilst there are different house types on the north side and at the end of the cul-de-sac, it forms part of the street scene on the south side of the road
-

where it is seen alongside the other similar semi-detached dwellings there. These are also raised above road level and form a long and continuous row. There are no other examples of front extensions there. As a consequence, the row has a generally uniform appearance and consistent building line. In this context the proposed extension would stand out as an obvious and incongruous addition that would be appreciated as an unsympathetic feature in the street scene.

7. The appellant refers to existing front extensions at properties on nearby roads which are the same house type as the appeal property. However, I saw at my visit that these examples form part of different street scenes and contexts and so are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme. Moreover, I am not aware of the circumstances that led to those existing developments and so cannot be sure that they are the same as in the case before me. I confirm in any event that I have considered the appeal proposal on its individual merits and made my own assessment as to its impact. As such, these examples do not justify the appeal scheme.
8. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. This would be contrary to Policy LP1 of the of the Kirklees Local Plan (Local Plan) which seeks to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It would conflict with Local Plan Policy LP2 which sets out that development should seek to build on strengths, opportunities and help to address the challenges identified in the Local Plan.
9. The proposal would also fail to support Local Plan Policy LP24 which advises that good design should be at the core of all proposals and that they should promote good design by ensuring the form scale, layout and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the townscape (a), and that extensions are subservient to the original building, and are inkeeping with the existing buildings in terms of scale, materials and details (c).
10. Furthermore, the proposal would be at odds with the Council's House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). SPD Key Principle 1 states that extensions and alterations to residential properties should be inkeeping with the appearance, scale, design and local character of the area and the street scene. SPD Principle 2 advises that extensions should not dominate or be larger than the original house and should be inkeeping with the existing building in terms of scale, materials and detail.
11. Additionally, the proposal would conflict with the aim of paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates that decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Other matters

12. The extension is sought in order to future proof living arrangements at the property. Whilst no further details or explanation of this are provided, I accept that this is a benefit of the proposal. However, it is insufficient to outweigh the harm that would arise in relation to the main issue as described above.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all the other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Worthington

INSPECTOR